

ROBERT BEAUMONT
3 HIGH NOON WAY
BALT MD. 21206

1/14/93

DEAR MR. WEISBERG,

I AM WRITING, FIRST AND FOREMOST, TO SAY "THANK YOU" FOR THE MANY VALUABLE CONTRIBUTIONS YOU HAVE MADE OVER THE YEARS TOWARD BRINGING THE CONTROVERSIES SURROUNDING THE DEATH OF JFK OUT INTO THE OPEN. I AND MILLIONS LIKE ME OWE MUCH TO PIONEERS LIKE YOURSELF, SYLVIA MEAGHER, MARK LANE, EDWARD JAY EPSTEIN, ETC., AND I WANTED TO TAKE THE TIME TO EXPRESS THE GRATITUDE OF AT LEAST MYSELF AND SEVERAL OF MY CLOSE FRIENDS. ~~WE ARE ALL WHO I HAVE TO MENTION AS~~ WE HAVE ALL FOLLOWED THESE EVENTS CLOSELY THROUGH THE YEARS, AND ARE ALL STILL ANXIOUSLY SEEKING THE TRUTH.

YOU WERE CONTACTED RECENTLY BY MY GOOD FRIEND SCOTT WILSON, OF MASSAPEQUA, NEW YORK. HE WAS THRILLED AND GRATEFUL FOR YOUR RETURNED CORRESPONDENCE. HE AND I HAVE SPENT A LOT OF TIME TOGETHER RESEARCHING AND DISCUSSING THE EVENTS BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER THE ASSASSINATION. BETWEEN US, WE'VE ACCUMULATED AN IMPRESSIVE AMOUNT OF LITERATURE AND INFORMATION REGARDING THOSE EVENTS. I WON'T TAKE UP YOUR TIME DISCUSSING OUR THEORIES OR ~~OUR~~ FEELINGS

ABOUT THE ASSASSINATION, BUT, IF YOU WOULD BE SO KIND, WE DO HAVE SOME QUESTIONS WHICH I, PERSONALLY, FEEL THAT ~~THE~~ FEW PEOPLE OTHER THAN YOURSELF ARE MORE QUALIFIED TO ANSWER.

FIRST OFF: I'VE JUST FINISHED READING THE BOOK "THE MAN WHO KNEW TOO MUCH," ABOUT RICHARD CASE NAGELL. I FIND THIS TO BE, IF TRUE, A TRULY FASCINATING ANGLE TO THE CASE. THERE IS SO MUCH, HOWEVER, ABOUT NAGELL THAT I FIND, WELL, TO PUT IT BLUNTLY, SOMEWHAT FLAKY. WHAT ARE YOUR THOUGHTS ON THE NAGELL CASE, AND DO YOU FEEL THIS IS AN AREA THAT WARRANTS FURTHER RESEARCH?

HARRISON LIVINGSTONE'S HIGH TREASON 2 WAS, FRANKLY, RATHER DISAPPOINTING. SURE, IT SEEMS WELL RESEARCHED, BUT WHEN YOU REALLY GET INTO IT, IT SEEMS TO BE A SOMEWHAT RAMBLING NARRATIVE THAT JUST, WELL, NEVER REALLY MAKES A STRONG POINT ABOUT ANYTHING! PLUS, THE AUTHOR WILL EXAMINE, IN DETAIL, ONE POINT, THEN, A HUNDRED PAGES LATER, HE'S BELABORING THE SAME POINT AGAIN! THE ORIGINAL HIGH TREASON WAS, I FELT, WORTH READING. IN "2", HOWEVER, THE CO-AUTHORS'

FALLING OUT SEEMS TO HAVE INFECTED THE WORK, AND WHATEVER IT'S MESSAGE WAS SUPPOSED TO HAVE BEEN. I'VE SPOKE WITH ROBERT GRODEN SEVERAL TIMES ON THE TELEPHONE, AND IN ONE CONVERSATION EXPRESSED MY DISAPPOINTMENT WITH HT2. HIS RESPONSE WAS "I'M SORRY YOU BOUGHT THAT PIECE OF CRAP. IT'S GARBAGE!" THERE SEEMS TO BE A LOT OF THAT SORT OF SENTIMENT AMONG ASSASSINATION AUTHORS, UNFORTUNATELY. I'VE HEARD NUMEROUS INSTANCES OF ONE AUTHOR ATTACKING ANOTHER'S THEORY, CRITICIZING EACH OTHER'S BOOKS, ETC, BUT VERY LITTLE OF RESEARCHERS SWALLOWING THEIR EGOS AND WORKING TOGETHER, AN ECONOMY OF FORCE, SO TO SPEAK, WHICH MAY PROVE THE SMARTER WAY TO GO. WHAT ARE YOUR THOUGHTS ON THIS?

TO MY MIND, ONE OF THE MOST INTERESTING INDIVIDUALS I'VE BEEN MADE AWARE OF IN MY TWO DECADES OF STUDYING THE ASSASSINATION IS WITHOUT A DOUBT L. FLETCHER PROUTY. HIS THEORIES AND INSIGHTS HAVE OPENED MY EYES AND MY MIND TO SO MANY REALITIES THAT ~~WAS AWARE~~ I OTHERWISE WOULD NEVER HAVE BEEN AWARE OF. I HAVE A COPY OF "THE SECRET TEAM", AND I HAVE THE BOOK "JFK", BOTH AUTHORED BY HIM,

AND I DON'T KNOW WHICH ONE IS MORE FASCINATING. AS AN EX-MILITARY MAN, I CAN RELATE TO MANY OF HIS SENTIMENTS REGARDING THE POWER OF OUR NATION'S MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT AS WELL AS THE SCOPE AND REACH OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY. AND SO MUCH OF WHAT HE SAYS ABOUT EVENTS SURROUNDING THAT DAY IN DALLAS MAKES SUCH PERFECT SENSE. ONCE YOU SEE THINGS LIKE THE LACK OF A MILITARY PRESENCE IN THE STREETS, THE OPEN WINDOWS IN THE BUILDINGS, THE CONVOLUTED TURNS THE LIMOUSINE HAD TO MAKE ON ELM AND MAIN STREETS, THE LACK OF SECURITY IN THE CROWDS, IN THE LIGHT OF A PLANNED EVENT, YOU NEVER CAN LOOK AT THEM ANY OTHER WAY, I FEEL. WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THIS? IS FLETCHER PROUTY POINTING US DOWN THE RIGHT PATH? AM I ON THE RIGHT TRACK?

THE BOOK "COUP DE TAT IN AMERICA" BY ALAN WEBERMAN AND MICHAEL CANTFIELD MAKES A COMPELLING CASE FOR HOWARD HUNT AND FRANK STURGIS BEING TWO OF THE TRAMPS ARRESTED IN DEALEY PLAZA, BUT I'M STILL NOT ENTIRELY CONVINCED. I ALSO HAVE A COPY OF "PLAUSIBLE DENIAL", WHICH DETAILS THE

Robert Beaumont
3 High Noon Way
Baltimore, MD 21206

1/16/93

Dear Mr. Beaumont,

Thanks for your letter of the 14th. I appreciate it.

I can't take the time to answer all your questions. As a generality, I regard the flood of books that theorize solutions to the assassination as not good. Most of the authors know little or nothing about the established fact and the small minority that has a slight knowledge have not kept up with what has been disclosed since the Report was issued. The result is that in varying degrees their books misrepresent, deceive and mislead and they all combine to have created enormous confusion, a boon to the assassins and to errant government.

You refer to researching. That is not what is done in chewing this rancid cud over and over again. Research begins with fact. Information also is fact, not Perry Masoning.

I did not finish The Man Who Knew Too Much. The author knows little about the fact of the assassination and he could not make Nagell's incredible story credible. I am not interested in any version of Nagell's story. What he says about the assassination is not real. So I regard it as not worth any time at all.

There is controversy among the authors of this theorized crap. If any one is right the others are wrong and they don't like it. Some are literary thieves, which does not earn them love. Some are jealous, some have had fights, etc. I stay out of all that I can. It wastes time, as they do.

I've not read Fletch Prouty's new book and do not intend to. He is a friend, a personable man, but he does not know the fact of the assassination and I'm aware of what his theories have been. It is ~~xxx~~ never possible to cover all the windows and rooves in a motorcade. If it had to be done would there ever be a New York parade?

The case against Howard Hunt does not exist. The Weberman book is a phony and I think Hunt sued and beat him. Plausible Denial is an outrageous imposition on the people's trust. Despite what Lane says the only issue in the lawsuit was malice. When the article was based on actual sources, albeit incorrect ones, there was no malice. The rest is typical Lane fabrication and the witnesses he quotes did not figure in the decision and have no credibility at all. Any time spent on that is worse than wasted. Are you beginning to see why I regard the works that are not factual as harmful?

I think it was that skunk Donahue who started the lie that I had expected the Univ. of Md. to want my files. You give me a variant of that. There is not a word of truth to it and there never was. I never spoke to them, they never spoke to me, and I've long had the arrangements I preferred. Everything I have will be a permanent archive at local Hood College, and excellent school with a fine history faculty.

Best wishes, Harold Weisberg